



2



6

**IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT
BILASPUR**

REVIEW PETITION No. 187 / 2012

Single Bench

PETITIONER :

VYASNARAYAN GUPTA

AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,
S/O LATE MANRAKHAN LAL GUPTA,
RESIDENT -AARANG, TEHSIL AARANG,
DISTT. RAIPUR (CG) (**DEFENDANT NO.2**)
THANA - AARANG P.No. 493-441

Versus

RESPONDENTS :

1. **KAMALNARAYAN GUPTA AND OTHERS**

AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
S/O LATE MANRAKHAN LAL GUPTA,
RESIDENT -AARANG, TEHSIL AARANG,
DISTT. RAIPUR (CG) (**PLAINTIFF**)
THANA - AARANG P.No. 493-441

2. **SHIVNARAYAN GUPTA**

AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS
S/O LATE MANRAKHAN LAL GUPTA,
RESIDENT -AARANG, TEHSIL AARANG,
DISTT. RAIPUR (CG) (**DEFENDANT NO.1**)
THANA - AARANG P.No. 493-441

3. **JAINARAYAN GUPTA**

AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS
S/O LATE MANRAKHAN LAL GUPTA,
RESIDENT -AARANG, TEHSIL AARANG,
DISTT. RAIPUR (CG) (**DEFENDANT NO.3**)
THANA - AARANG P.No. 493-441

4. **SMT.KUSUM GUPTA**

AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
W/O RAJENDRA PRASAD GUPTA
R/O JUNA BILASPUR, KRISHNA WARD,
BILASPUR (CG) (**DEFENDANT NO.4**)
THANA - CITY ROTWALE P.No. 495-001

5. **SMT ANSUIYA BAI**

ABOUT 80 YEARS,
WIDOW OF LATE MANRAKHAN LAL GUPTA,
RESIDENT -AARANG, TEHSIL AARANG, DISTT.
RAIPUR (CG) (**DEFENDANT NO.5**)
THANA - AARANG P.No. 493-441

6. **STATE OF CHHATTISGARH**

THROUGH THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, RAIPUR
(CG) (**DEFENDANT NO.6**)

**APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF THE ORDER DATED 12.10.2011
PASSED BY HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH IN
WP (227) NO. 5688/2011.**

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

44

Review Petition No.187 of 2012

PETITIONER:

Vyasnarayan Gupta

(Defendant No.2)

Versus

RESPONDENTS:

1. Kamalnarayan Gupta

(Plaitniff)

2. Shivnarayan Gupta

(Defendant No.1)

3. Jainarayan Gupta

(Defendant No.3)

4. Smt. Kusum Gupta

(Defendant No.4)

5. Smt. Ansuiya Bai

(Defendant No.5)

6. State of Chhattisgarh

(Defendant No.6)

{Application for review}

Present:

Mr. Anshuman Shrivastava, counsel for the petitioners.

Miss Sangeeta Mishra, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondent No.6.

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. T.P. Sharma, J

ORDER

(30-11-2012)

1. This is review petition against order dated 12-10-2011 passed by this Court in W.P.(Art. 227)No.5688/2011.
2. Registry has pointed some defaults.
3. Heard and perused.
4. On due consideration, I do not find any ground for review of order dated 12-10-2011 passed by this Court in W.P.(Art. 227)No.5688/2011. Consequently, the review petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

T.P.Sharma
Judge